Remarks

In the interest of clarity, the paragraph numbers hereafter match the paragraph numbers in the Office Action.

1.   Claim 9 has been amended to correct the dependency problem identified by the Examiner.

2-3 and 5.   The Office Action rejected each of claims 1-3 and 5 as obvious over Mazzara. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In the Response to Argument section of the Office Action, the Office Action indicates that the features that Applicant relied upon as distinguishing in the previous Office Action are not recited in the rejected claims. Specifically, the Office Action indicates that a simple derivative block and subtracting an acceleration feedback signal are not recited in claim 1. Applicant did not intend to argue that a derivative block and a subtraction step distinguish claim 1 from Mazzara. Instead, Applicant meant to state the <u>fact</u> that Mazzara fails to teach or suggest an acceleration error determiner that performs the function of the claim 1 determiner. Simply put, Mazzara fails to teach or suggest a determiner that generates an acceleration error that is the <u>difference between a derivative of a command velocity and a motor acceleration value</u>. There is <u>no location</u> within Mazzara's disclosed circuit where the difference between a derivative of any velocity signal and a motor acceleration value (or any other value for that matter) is generated and therefore Mazzara clearly does not teach this limitation. With respect to the output of Mazzara's controller 31, that output is <u>not</u> a derivative and instead is a value that was stepped up via a full PID controller or at least a controller that has a proportional component (see col. 6, lines 16-21). For at least this reason Applicant believes that claim 1 is novel over Mazzara and requests that the standing rejection be withdrawn.

Applicant also notes that in the most recent Office Action response Applicant did not simply rely on a derivative block and a subtracting step to distinguish over Mazzara. In addition, Applicant explicitly pointed out that Mazzara fails to teach or suggest a low pass filter as required by claim 1. To the extent that this rejection is maintained, Applicant requests that the Examiner indicate precisely where Mazzara teaches or even suggests use of a low pass filter.

Applicant has introduced no new matter in making the above remarks. In view of the above remarks, Applicant believes claims 1-11 and 13-22 of the present application recite patentable subject matter and allowance of the same is requested. No fee in addition to the fees already authorized in this and accompanying documentation is believed to be required to enter this amendment, however, if an additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account No. 17-0055 in the amount of the fee.

Respectfully submitted,

THOMAS J. REHM

Date: S - 4 - 06

By: _____

Michael A. Jaskolski
Reg. No. 37,551
Attorney for Applicant
QUARLES & BRADY, LLP
411 East Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, WI. 53202-4497
(414) 277-5711

QBMKE\5892304.1